



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,008	12/21/2000	Robert G. Schaefer	PM 0272835	6665

7590

05/26/2005

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP

Stephen C. Glazier

1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW

Suite 200

Washington, DC 20036-1221

EXAMINER

GYORFI, THOMAS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/741,008

Applicant(s)

SCHAEFER ET AL.

Examiner

Tom Gyorfi

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 66-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 66-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/22/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 66-101 remain for examination. The correspondence filed 2/22/05 amended claims 66, 73, 78, 85, 90, and 97.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/22/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant argues, "*Bennett does not teach or suggest a system like the claimed invention, which is not peer-to-peer, and wherein each local computer system may establish a single relationship with an intermediate computer system between the local computer systems and the remote computer systems, and which intermediate computer system provides interfaces tailored to each local computer system.*" It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies in this argument are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims only describe a relationship between a programmable computer and a plurality of applications (i.e., software programs), with no limitations regarding any relationship between one or more unspecified computers running said applications and the previously disclosed programmable computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 66-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (U.S. Patent 6,092,121).

Referring to Claims 66, 78 and 90:

Bennet disclose a method comprising:

(a) receiving, with a programmable computer, read data requests, write data requests, and requests to perform operations from a plurality of incompatible applications (col 2, lines 5-45; col 5, lines 50-65), said incompatible applications comprising:

- (i) an insurance application (col 3, lines 30-45),
- (ii) a bank application (col 3, lines 30-45),
- (ii) a vehicle dealer application (col 3, lines 30-45), and
- (iii) a motor vehicle agency application (col 3, lines 30-45);

(b) transmitting, with a programmable computer, received requests to a plurality of incompatible databases, said incompatible databases comprising:

- (i) an insurance database (col 3, lines 30-45),
- (ii) a bank database (col 3, lines 30-45),
- (iii) a vehicle dealer database (col 3, lines 30-45), and
- (iv) a motor vehicle agency database (col 3, lines 30-45);

(c) receiving, with the programmable computer, data responses from the plurality of incompatible databases, the data responses corresponding to the transmitted requests from the plurality of incompatible applications (col 6, lines 20-65); and

(d) transmitting, with the programmable computer, the data responses to the plurality of incompatible applications, each data responses being transmitted in a format compatible with the application to which it is transmitted (col 2, lines 45-65).

Referring to Claims 67, 79 and 91:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses managing communications connections and request queues (col 6, lines 1-20).

Referring to Claims 68, 80 and 92:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses checking authorization of an application to make a request (col 4, lines 25-40).

Referring to Claims 69, 81 and 93:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses generating an audit list of data requests for tracking transactions (col 4, lines 30-50).

Referring to Claims 70, 82 and 94:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses checking authorization of an application to receive a response (col 4, lines 25-50).

Referring to Claims 71, 83 and 95:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses employing an application interface specific to each of the plurality of incompatible applications (col 4, lines 10-30; col 5, lines 50-65).

Referring to Claims 72, 84 and 96:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses, wherein the step of receiving data responses comprises employing software components for allowing databases to access other databases (col 4, lines 10-25).

Referring to Claims 73, 85 and 97:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses, wherein data responses are received from interfaces specific to the incompatible databases, the interfaces extracting data from appropriate files and fields in the databases and mapping and performing stored procedures upon the extracted data to provide responses to requests (col 6, line 60-col 7, line 30).

Referring to Claims 74, 86 and 98:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses monitoring all received requests and all data responses to identify any request

Art Unit: 2135

or response that constitutes an application trigger and for generating an appropriate application trigger message to activate an appropriate application in response to an application trigger (col 7, lines 15-40).

Referring to Claim 75, 87 and 99:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses, wherein the requests and data responses are transmitted electronically using at least one of : the Internet, leased telephone lines, wireless communication, local area networks, wide-area networks, dial-up, a combination of telecommunication links, satellite communication, and exchange of removable media (Fig. 1; col 3, lines 45-66).

Referring to Claim 76, 88 and 100:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses, wherein said incompatible applications further comprise one or more of: after market store applications, salvage company applications, supplier company applications, car company applications, retailer applications, consumer applications, internet-based applications, auction house applications, automotive broker applications, collision repair applications, and information broker company applications (col 7, lines 45-55).

Referring to Claims 77, 89 and 101:

Bennett discloses the limitation of Claims 66, 78 and 90 above. Bennett further discloses, wherein said incompatible databases further comprise one or more of: after market store databases, salvage company databases, supplier company databases, car company databases, retailer databases, consumer databases, internet-based databases, auction house databases, automotive broker databases, collision repair databases, and information broker company databases (col 3, lines 25-40, col 7, lines 45-44).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3849. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TAG
5/18/05


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100